



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/591,205

08/31/2006

Graham Richard Wyatt

06-707

6055

20306

7590

01/06/2011

MCDONNELL BOEHNEN HULBERT & BERGHOFF LLP
300 S. WACKER DRIVE
32ND FLOOR
CHICAGO, IL 60606

EXAMINER

AVERY, JEREMIAH L

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2431

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

01/06/2011

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/591,205	Applicant(s) WYATT ET AL.	
	Examiner JEREMIAH AVERY	Art Unit 2431	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 October 2010.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5,7-16 and 22-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5,7-16 and 22-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 31 August 2006 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

- I. Claims 17-21 were cancelled in a preliminary amendment.
- II. Claim 6 has been cancelled.
- III. Claims 1-5, 7-16 and 22-24 have been examined.
- IV. Responses to Applicant's remarks have been given.

Response to Arguments

- 1. Applicant's arguments, see page 6, filed 10/20/10, with respect to 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph rejection of claim 5 have been fully considered and are persuasive. The 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph rejection of claim 5 has been withdrawn.
- 2. The objection to claims 1 and 22-24 has been withdrawn due to Applicant's amendment to said claims.
- 3. In response to Applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., on page 7 of the Applicant's remarks, "The presently claimed invention is directed to a substantially *automated method of removing covert threats hidden or concealed in a document, not by visually/manually analyzing the documents to identify those threats, but rather by applying predetermined automated transformations to the documents thereby to mitigate the effect of such threats without identification of the specific threats and without requiring intervention by a human operator*") are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

4. Further, dependent claims 3 and 10 convey human interaction (i.e., claim 3: "which the second document is digitally signed by a sanctioning user" and claim 10: "in which the review and sanction comprises sanction by a human user"); thus a human component is part of the Applicant's claimed invention.

5. Regardless, according to MPEP 2144.04, "The court held that broadly providing an automatic or mechanical means to replace a manual activity which accomplished the same result is not sufficient to distinguish over the prior art."; *In re Venner*, 262 F.2d 91, 95, 120 USPQ 193, 194 (CCPA 1958).

6. Regarding the Applicant's argument that the claimed "security threats" pertain to "malicious code" and that Patton is silent in disclosing this; the Examiner upholds that the independent claims – though claiming "security threats" – do not state that said "security threats" pertain to "malicious code". Dependent claims 11 and 12 are directed towards "malicious code" and the prior art reference Walsh was utilized in disclosing said "malicious code" via Figure 2, elements 204 and 208, Figure 3, elements 302 and 304 and column 9, lines 24-33, "Once the computer is infected with the macro virus, each computer file that you save is automatically infected with the macro virus".

7. Also, the Applicant argues that Patton "positively teaches away both from the specifically claimed material and from one underlying goal, namely to provide an automated means of mitigating the risk from covert threats. Those covert threats may relate to leakage of (maliciously) concealed confidential information, or transmission of computer viruses, etc. - concealed within electronic documents whereby to minimize human intervention which would otherwise cause an undesirable bottle-neck in such

Art Unit: 2431

systems". The Examiner reiterates that the automation is not explicitly stated within the claim language, nor is it a novel component. Further, Patton was not utilized to disclose the claimed "malicious code".

8. Regarding the Applicant's argument that "Whilst Simard might arguably add entropy and or randomness, etc. to an image, it does not do so in any context of automatedly mitigating covert threats embedded within the image whilst substantially maintaining the visible image whereby to minimize human involvement"; the Examiner upholds that the automated means are not explicitly stated within the claim language and that Simard does disclose "at least one of entropy and randomness" as claimed by the Applicant via the cited grounds below.

9. With regards to the Applicant's argument pertaining to claim 4, the Examiner upholds that Patton discloses the feature within said claim via page 3, paragraph 31 and page 4, paragraph 40, "while authorized internal engineers 120 can have access to all global export DPs 118 on web site 124, the global engineers 122 are preferably limited to being able to access only global export issued DPs 118 that have been designated or assigned to the authorized global engineer 122 on web site 124".

10. With regards to the Applicant's arguments pertaining to the "transformation" step within claim 5, the Examiner upholds that Patton discloses this feature via, but not limited to, page 4, paragraph 39, "issued DP 114 is preferably converted into a HTML format or a read-only, portable file format, e.g. PDF". Though the format of the document has changed, the document is still able to be read by the user within Patton (i.e., page 5, paragraph 47, "the author 102 can also perform character or text searches,

Art Unit: 2431

which are described in steps 318-320, on the 'sanitized' draft DP 110 in its portable or read-only format, e.g. in its PDF format, rather than on the draft DP 108 in its word processing format, e.g. in its Word format").

11. With regards to claim 15, combining the references of Patton and Williams would not take away from the teachings of Patton since it would be obvious to provide a means to scrub documents prior to transport – regardless of the domain (higher or lower) sending/receiving the scrubbed document – in order to provide security against an external source from unduly altering or obtaining access to the restricted content of the document(s).

Claim Objections

12. Claim 7 is objected to because of the following informalities: dependency upon cancelled claim (claim 6). Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

13. Claims 15 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The Applicant added the claim language of "wherein a security domain comprises a network having a common level of resilience to security threats" to claim 1; however, dependent claims 15 and 16 indicate that the security domains are of different levels. It is unclear as to how the domains can have "a common level" and yet also be of different levels.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 1, 2, 4-10, 14, 16 and 22-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over United States Patent Application Publication No. US 2003/0145017 to Patton et al., hereinafter Patton and further in view of United States Patent No. United States Patent No. 7,624,277 to Simard et al., hereinafter Simard.

14. Regarding claims 1, 22, 23 and 24, Patton teaches a method, an apparatus, a computer chipset and a computer readable medium having program code record thereon for communicating an electronic document between security domains, wherein a security domain comprises a network having a common level of resilience to security threats, the method comprising the steps of:
receiving, in a first security domain (page 3, paragraph 29, "internal source" and "United States"), a request to transmit to a second security domain (page 3, paragraph 29,

“external sources” and “out of the United States or to foreign persons, whether in the United States or abroad”) a first electronic document in a first data format capable of supporting *one or more* covert security threats (page 3, paragraph 29);

creating a second document in a second data format incapable of supporting the one or more security threats, responsive to the content of the first document (page 3, paragraph 30, “remove restricted information, technical data and proprietary information from a master document” and paragraph 32, page 4, paragraph 37, “the draft DP 108 is in a word processing file format such as Microsoft Word, Corel WordPerfect or any other suitable word processing format. The draft DP 108 can be converted using the sanitization application and the process described in greater detail below, to a ‘sanitized’ draft DP 110 and a ‘sanitized’ draft DP log 112.” and paragraph 39, “issued DP 114 is preferably converted into a HTML format or a read-only, portable file format, e.g. PDF” and page 5, paragraph 47, “the author 102 can also perform character or text searches, which are described in steps 318-320, on the ‘sanitized’ draft DP 110 in its portable or read-only format, e.g. in its PDF format, rather than on the draft DP 108 in its word processing format, e.g. in its Word format”);

forwarding the second document in place of the first document to the second security domain (page 3, paragraph 31, “After making a determination to provide specific content included within the log file to an external or global source and taking some additional steps to ensure that appropriate security and authorization procedures have been followed, the specific content included within the log file can be transferred to

Art Unit: 2431

the external or global source following the more restrictive U.S. Government export control license or company or organizational legal arrangements").

15. Patton teaches the claimed invention, as cited above. However, Patton does not teach the claim language pertaining to "wherein creating said second document comprises adding *at least one of* entropy and randomness to at least one characteristic of the representation of the first document". Simard teaches said claim language, as cited below.

16. Regarding claims 1, 22, 23 and 24, Simard teaches wherein creating said second document comprises adding *at least one of* entropy and randomness to at least one characteristic of the representation of the first document (column 6, lines 3-11, "generate a random character string image" and column 7, lines 36-52, "generates each image using a random set of characters").

17. The motivation to combine to prevent "a script from successfully running a repetitive task that is supposed to be performed by a human" (*Simard* – column 3, lines 5-7).

18. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Simard with the teachings of Patton to provide a methodology that "yields significant reductions in spam, software piracy, and operating costs and yields significant improvements in security" (*Simard* – column 3, lines 18-20).

19. Regarding claim 2, Patton teaches in which forwarding of the second document is conditional upon user sanction (page 4, paragraph 39, "Once the draft DP 108, the

Art Unit: 2431

sanitized draft DP 110 and the sanitized draft DP log 112 have been approved by approvers 106, the draft DP 108 is then converted into an issued DP 114 that operates as a master document, a global export issued DP log 116 and a global export issued DP 118.”).

20. Regarding claim 4, Patton teaches in which the second document is forwarded to the second security domain via at least one data diode (page 3, paragraph 31 and page 4, paragraph 40).

21. Regarding claim 5, Patton teaches in which the step of creating the second document comprises performing a transformation to the first document which modifies the underlying data format of the document whilst preserving the visible informational content (page 4, paragraph 39, “issued DP 114 is preferably converted into a HTML format or a read-only, portable file format, e.g. PDF” and page 5, paragraph 47, “the author 102 can also perform character or text searches, which are described in steps 318-320, on the ‘sanitized’ draft DP 110 in its portable or read-only format, e.g. in its PDF format, rather than on the draft DP 108 in its word processing format, e.g. in its Word format”).

22. Regarding claim 7, Patton teaches in which the at least one characteristic comprises *at least one of* colour and spacing (page 6, paragraph 52, “the collapsing of any spaces” and paragraph 55 and page 7, remainder of paragraph 57).

23. Patton teaches the claimed invention, as cited above. However, Patton does not teach the claim language pertaining to “in which the step of creating the second

Art Unit: 2431

document comprises applying a lossy compression method". Simard teaches said claim language, as cited below.

24. Regarding claim 8, Simard teaches in which the step of creating the second document comprises applying a lossy compression method (column 12, lines 29-34).

25. The motivation to combine would be "because the lossy compression yields even smaller images and additional security" (*Simard* - column 12, lines 31-34).

26. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Simard with the teachings of Patton to render the data in a manner "that a human can easily read but that is hard for a computer to read" (*Simard* – column 12, lines 45-57).

27. Regarding claim 9, Patton teaches comprising the step of: conveying the second document to a user sanction function for review and sanction prior to sending the second document to the second security domain (page 3, paragraph 31, "The log file can be viewed by authorized internal users to confirm what information has been removed from the document or to determine if specific contents of the log file can be provided to an external source under more restrictive export control licenses or appropriate legal arrangements.").

28. Regarding claim 10, Patton teaches in which review and sanction comprises sanction by a human user (page 3, paragraph 35, "In other words, the sanitization application can be downloaded to the authorized user's computer from another computer over a network connection or an Internet connection and can then be operated without the network connection. The user is able to use the sanitization

Art Unit: 2431

application without a network connection and is able to store the master documents, sanitized documents, document log files and related information and documents in a database.” and page 4, remainder of paragraph 35 and paragraph 39, “The draft DP 108, the sanitized draft DP 110 and the sanitized DP log 112 can be reviewed by reviewers 104, which can include author 102, and then approved by approvers 106, which can include author 102 and reviewers 104).

29. Regarding claim 14, Patton teaches in which the first security domain and second security domain are rated at different security levels (page 3, paragraphs 29-31, “the master document, when viewed by internal or company users, is identical to the original or master document, except that the information designated for removal from the original or master document is distinguished from the remaining text and/or graphics. In contrast, when viewed by an external or global source, the sanitized document does not include any information designated for removal from the original or master document”).

30. Regarding claim 16, Patton teaches in which the first security domain is a higher-level security domain than the second security domain (page 3, paragraph 29, “internal source” and “United States”, “external sources” and “out of the United States or to foreign persons, whether in the United States or abroad” and paragraph 31).

[Wherein the claimed “first security domain” is interpreted by the Examiner to pertain to Patton's disclosure of an “internal source” and “the United States” with regards to certain information not being able to be sent outside of the United States. The claimed “second security domain”

pertains to Patton's disclosure of "external sources" and to areas "out of the United States".]

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

31. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Patton as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of United States Patent No. 5,787,175 to Carter, hereinafter Carter.

32. Patton and Simard teach the claimed invention, as cited above. However, Patton and Simard do not teach the claim language within claim 3 pertaining to "in which the second document is digitally signed by a sanctioning user". Carter teaches said claim language, as cited below.

33. Regarding claim 3, Carter teaches in which the second document is digitally signed by a sanctioning user (column 17, lines 28-47, "Collaborative signatures control

Art Unit: 2431

the attribution of a given version of the work group document 90 to one or more members of the collaborative group”).

34. The motivation to combine would be “to provide such a method and apparatus which limit access to work group documents to those people who are expected to contribute directly to the document” (*Carter* - column 5, lines 25-28).

35. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Carter with the teachings of Patton and Simard “to provide such a method and apparatus which permit any given member of the work group to independently change the cryptographic method used for key generation in order to foil unauthorized decryption attempts, without preventing authorized access to the document” (*Carter* – column 5, lines 62-67).

36. Claims 11-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Patton and Simard, as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of United States Patent No. 5,956,481 to Walsh et al., hereinafter Walsh.

37. Patton and Simard teach the claimed invention, as cited above. However, Patton and Simard do not teach the claim language pertaining to the presence of “malicious code”. Walsh teaches said language, as cited below. The same motivation and obviousness to combine will pertain to each of claims 11, 12 and 13.

38. Regarding claim 11, Walsh teaches in which the one or more security threats comprise presence in the first document of malicious code (Figure 2, elements 204 and 208, Figure 3, elements 302 and 304, Figure 4C and Figure 5B, column 7, lines 3-10, column 9, lines 13-52, "Once the computer is infected with the macro virus, each

Art Unit: 2431

computer file that you save is automatically infected with the macro virus" and "A macro virus uses the macro programming language of an executable program to distribute the macro virus to data files on a computer system").

39. Regarding claim 12, Walsh teaches in which the malicious code comprises *at least one of* a computer virus and a Trojan horse (Figure 2, elements 204 and 208, Figure 3, elements 302 and 304, Figure 4C and Figure 5B, column 7, lines 3-10, column 9, lines 13-52, "Once the computer is infected with the macro virus, each computer file that you save is automatically infected with the macro virus" and "A macro virus uses the macro programming language of an executable program to distribute the macro virus to data files on a computer system", column 10, lines 7-34, column 11, lines 16-28, column 12, lines 26-37 and 53-65).

40. Regarding claim 13, Walsh teaches in which the *one or more* security threats comprises data steganographically concealed within the first document (column 2, lines 4-6, "macro virus could attack a document by inserting a copy of itself into the data file" and column 9, lines 13-52, "Once the computer is infected with the macro virus, each computer file that you save is automatically infected with the macro virus" and "A macro virus uses the macro programming language of an executable program to distribute the macro virus to data files on a computer system").

41. The motivation to combine would be to provide "a system for protecting a computer from infection by a virus that attacks data files of an executable program" (*Walsh* – column 2, lines 62-64).

Art Unit: 2431

42. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Walsh with the teachings of Patton and Simard in order to “protect against an unauthorized loading of a virus component, such as macro code, that can result in damage to data file content and to computer storage” (Walsh – column 2, lines 65-67 and column 3, lines 1-4).

43. Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Patton and Simard as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of United States Patent No. 6,304,973 to Williams, hereinafter Williams.

44. Patton and Simard teach the claimed invention, as cited above. However, Patton and Simard do not teach the claim language pertaining to “the first security domain is a lower-level security domain than the second security domain”. Williams teaches said claim language, as cited below.

45. Regarding claim 15, Williams teaches in which the first security domain is a lower-level security domain than the second security domain (Figure 6, column 13, lines 10-21, “a Multi-Level Secure computer that is capable of simultaneously processing a range of Secret to Top Secret” and lines 25-37 and column 14, lines 7-9).

46. The motivation to combine would be “to provide a security device that prevents unauthorized third parties from gaining access to a host. It is another object of the invention to provide a multi-level secure network having a security device coupled between each host and the network medium” (*Williams* – column 4, lines 31-35).

47. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Williams with the teachings

Art Unit: 2431

of Patton and Simard so that the "network prevents unauthorized users from gaining access to sensitive information" (*Williams* - column 4, lines 41 and 42).

Conclusion

48. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

49. A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

50. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

51. The following United States Patents are cited to further show the state of the art with respect to secure distribution of messages within a network environment:

United States Patent No. 7,130,885 to Chandra et al., which is cited to show methods and apparatus providing electronic messages that are linked and aggregated.

United States Patent No. 6,216,231 to Stubblebine, which is cited to show specifying security protocols and policy constraints in distributed systems.

United States Patent No. 7,216,043 to Ransom et al., which is cited to show a push communications architecture for intelligent electronic devices.

52. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JEREMIAH AVERY whose telephone number is (571)272-8627. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Friday 8:30am-5pm.

53. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, William Korzuch can be reached on (571) 272-7589. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

54. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Jeremiah Avery/
Examiner, Art Unit 2431

/William R. Korzuch/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2431

Application/Control Number: 10/591,205
Art Unit: 2431

Page 18